



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/964,787	09/28/2001	Tomoaki Endoh	03500.015845.	3430
5514	7590	01/05/2010	EXAMINER	
FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO 1290 Avenue of the Americas NEW YORK, NY 10104-3800			DULANEY, BENJAMIN O	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
	2625			
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
01/05/2010	PAPER			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/964,787	ENDOH, TOMOAKI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	BENJAMIN O. DULANEY	2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 September 2009.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 45-54 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 45-54 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 9/18/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding applicant's argument for claim 45 that Debry does not teach the newly amended feature of determining the enablement of deleting a job based upon the first decryption results corresponding to the second decryption results, examiner disagrees. While Choudhury is cited as teaching the first decryption step, the addition of the Debry forms a combination that uses the broad system set-up of Choudhury (directory server being separate from the information processing apparatus) to implement a public/private key decryption scheme with an access list of clients that lists privileges (access list column 9, lines 27-35 of Debry). Debry details a method (column 9, lines 5-35) of using access tickets to ensure the correct identity of a user of a system in order to determine the privileges associated with the user according to the access list. So a first decryption step (which is also taught by Choudhury) in Debry could be the print job fetching detailed in column 8, line 50—column 9, line 4, which is accomplished through a key checked against a user identity. Then a second decryption step is performed (column 9, lines 5-35) as detailed, upon other communications containing access tickets such as deleting a job (line 33) where the digital certificate key is compared with the same user identity as the first decryption step above to determine what privileges a specific user has. Hence, if a user such as the operator on line 33 has registered a print job with a first certificate, and then wishes to delete that print job with a second certificate the

identities of the two certificates must match (and are therefore compared with each other) in order for the command to be allowed by the system of Debry, if the second certificate did not match the identity of the user (such as one of the “end users” in the example) then the privilege of deletion would not be enabled in the access control list.

Therefore the new limitation is taught.

Regarding applicant’s similar argument for claim 52, examiner disagrees on the same grounds as detailed above. Van Buren also functions based upon an access list (column 6, line 41), and the user (and password) must be the same for both the submission of printing operation (the first step) and the deletion of the job (the second step), and are thereby compared.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

- 1) Claims 45, 48 and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent 5,509,074 by Choudhury et al., and further in view of U.S. patent 6,385,728 by Debry.
- 2) Regarding claims 45, 48 and 51, Choudhury teaches a method of controlling peripheral equipment connected to a network and managed by a directory server (figure 2, item 107) on the network, said method comprising: a first step of receiving a print job

issued from an information processing apparatus (column 4, lines 19-22; “processing apparatus” is the document server) on the network together with a first access ticket issued from the directory server (column 4, lines 13-15 and 29-31; “directory server” is the copyright server and the access ticket is the unique identification number) with the directory server being separate from the information processing apparatus (figure 2, document server and copyright server are separate); a storing step of storing the print job received in said first receiving step in a storing medium (column 4, lines 7-10; printer inherently has hardware as mentioned to be able to decrypt a job, this hardware would necessarily include some type of memory to hold the description algorithm as well as the job as it is being decrypted); a first decrypting step of decrypting the first access ticket received together with the print job in said first receiving step (column 4, lines 25-26); a first control step of determining validity of the first access ticket received in said first receiving step based on a decrypting result of said first decrypting step and limiting execution of the print job received in said first receiving step (column 4, lines 25-31; if the identification is incorrect then a job cannot be printed and therefore the execution is limited to someone with the correct identification number).

Choudhury does not specifically teach a second receiving step of receiving a management command from an information processing apparatus on the network together with a second access ticket issued from the directory server, at timing independent of said first receiving step, with the directory server being separate from the information processing apparatus; a second decrypting step of decrypting the second access ticket received together with the management command in the second

receiving step; a second control step of determining validity of the second access ticket received in said second receiving step based on a decrypting result of said second decrypting step and limiting execution; wherein in the case where the management command received in said second receiving step is one for deleting a specific print job stored in the storing medium, said second control step compares user information in the decryption result of said second decrypting step with the user information in the decryption result of said first decrypting step and limits execution of deleting the specified print job in the storing medium if the user information in the decryption results of said second decrypting step does not correspond to the user information in the decryption results of said first decrypting step and enables execution of deleting the specified print job in the storing medium if the user information in the decryption results of said second decrypting step corresponds to the user information in the first decryption results of said first decrypting step.

Debry teaches a second receiving step of receiving a management command from an information processing apparatus on the network together with a second access ticket issued from the directory server (column 9, lines 28-35; commands such as deleting a job), at timing independent of said first receiving step, with the directory server being separate from the information processing apparatus (figure 4; certificate authority server, item 60, is separate from the user, item 20); a second decrypting step of decrypting the second access ticket received together with the management command in the second receiving step; a second control step of determining validity of the second access ticket received in said second receiving step based on a decrypting

result of said second decrypting step and limiting execution (column 9, lines 15-26; access is determined by the public key method, execution is limited according to the "access control list"); wherein in the case where the management command received in said second receiving step is one for deleting a specific print job stored in the storing medium, said second control step compares user information in the decryption result of said second decrypting step with the user information in the decryption result of said first decrypting step and limits execution of deleting the specified print job in the storing medium if the user information in the decryption results of said second decrypting step does not correspond to the user information in the decryption results of said first decrypting step and enables execution of deleting the specified print job in the storing medium if the user information in the decryption results of said second decrypting step corresponds to the user information in the first decryption results of said first decrypting step (column 9, lines 28-35; access control list is checked and depending upon the user's authority a deletion may be executed or prohibited, comparison is performed as explained in the arguments above).

Choudhury and Debry are combinable because they are both from the secure printing field of endeavor.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Choudhury with Debry to add a management command. The motivation for doing so would have been so that "the document may be protected from being accessed by anyone other than those users that have access

privileges" (column 4, lines 47-49). Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Choudhury and Debry to obtain the invention of claims 45, 48 and 51.

- 3) Claims 46 and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent 5,509,074 by Choudhury et al., and further in view of U.S. patent 6,385,728 by Debry, and further in view of U.S. patent 5,819,047 by Bauer et al.
- 4) Regarding claims 46 and 49, Choudhury does not specifically teach a method according to claim 45, wherein the decrypting result of said first decrypting step includes information about a permitted number of prints.

Bauer teaches a method according to claim 45, wherein the decrypting result of said first decrypting step includes information about a permitted number of prints (Column 4, lines 40-58).

Choudhury and Bauer are combinable because both are from the printing field of endeavor.

It would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Choudhury with Bauer to add a print quota. The motivation for doing so would have been to "provide a simplified way of controlling usage of resources of a networked computing system" (Column 2, lines 56-57). Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Choudhury with Bauer to obtain the invention as specified by claims 46 and 49.

5) Claims 47 and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent 5,509,074 by Choudhury et al., and further in view of U.S. patent 6,385,728 by Debry as applied to claims 45 and 48 above, and further in view of U.S. patent 6,762,853 by Takagi et al.

6) Regarding claims 47 and 50, Choudhury does not specifically teach a method wherein the management command received in said second receiving step is one for displaying a job list, said second control step changes a display for of the job list based on the decryption result of said second decrypting step.

Takagi teaches a method wherein the management command received in said second receiving step is one for displaying a job list, said second control step changes a display for of the job list based on the decryption result of said second decrypting step (figures 8 and 9; column 6, lines 5-14).

Choudhury and Takagi are combinable because they are both from the secure printing field of endeavor.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Choudhury with Takagi to add display of a users jobs. The motivation for doing so would have been user privacy. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Choudhury and Takagi to obtain the invention of claims 47 and 50.

7) Claims 52-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent 5,509,074 by Choudhury et al., and further in view of U.S. patent 6,667,816 by Van Buren et al.

Regarding claims 52-54, Choudhury teaches a method of controlling peripheral equipment connected to a network and managed by a directory server (figure 2, item 107) on the network, said method comprising: a first step of receiving a print job issued from an information processing apparatus (column 4, lines 19-22; “processing apparatus” is the document server) on the network together with an access ticket issued from the directory server (column 4, lines 13-15 and 29-31; “directory server” is the copyright server and the access ticket is the unique identification number) with the directory server being separate from the information processing apparatus (figure 2, document server and copyright server are separate); a storing step of storing the print job received in said first receiving step in a storing medium (column 4, lines 7-10; printer inherently has hardware as mentioned to be able to decrypt a job, this hardware would necessarily include some type of memory to hold the description algorithm as well as the job as it is being decrypted); a first decrypting step of decrypting the access ticket received together with the print job in said first receiving step (column 4, lines 25-26); a first control step of determining validity of the access ticket received in said first receiving step based on a decrypting result of said first decrypting step and limiting execution of the print job received in said first receiving step (column 4, lines 25-31; if the identification is incorrect then a job cannot be printed and therefore the execution is limited to someone with the correct identification number).

Choudhury does not specifically teach an obtaining step of obtaining, from the directory server, access information corresponding to a specific user; an inputting step of inputting a management command from an operation panel of the printer; a second control step of determining validity of the access information obtained in said obtaining step and limiting execution of the management command, wherein in the case where the management command inputted in said inputting step is one for deleting a specific print job stored in the storing medium, said second control step compares user information in the access information with user information in the decryption result of said decrypting step and limits execution of deleting the specific print job in the storing medium if the user information in the access information does not correspond to the user information in the decryption results of said first decrypting step and enables execution of deleting the specified print job in the storing medium if the user information in the access information corresponds to the user information in the decryption results of said first decrypting step.

Van Buren teaches an obtaining step of obtaining, from the directory server, access information corresponding to a specific user; an inputting step of inputting a management command from an operation panel of the printer (Column 6, lines 10-14); a second control step of determining validity of the access information obtained in said obtaining step and limiting execution of the management command (Column 6, lines 40-44), wherein in the case where the management command inputted in said inputting step is one for deleting a specific print job stored in the storing medium, said second control step compares user information in the access information with user information

in the decryption result of said decrypting step and limits execution of deleting the specific print job in the storing medium if the user information in the access information does not correspond to the user information in the decryption results of said first decrypting step and enables execution of deleting the specified print job in the storing medium if the user information in the access information corresponds to the user information in the decryption results of said first decrypting step (Column 7, lines 1-8, comparison is taught as detailed above in the arguments).

Choudhury and Van Buren are combinable because both are from the printing field of endeavor.

It would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Choudhury with Van Buren to add inputting a deletion command at the printing device interface. The motivation for doing so would have been so that "management commands" can be executed "only on command from the operator control unit (printer interface)" (Abstract). Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Choudhury with Van Buren to obtain the invention as specified by claims 52-54.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BENJAMIN O. DULANEY whose telephone number is (571)272-2874. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (10am - 6pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Moore can be reached on (571)272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Benjamin O Dulaney/

Examiner, Art Unit 2625

/David K Moore/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625